UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO
FACULTY OF LAW

BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY
3 1761 06108681 5

COURSE MATERIALS FOR INTENSIVE COURSE

COMPARATIVE LAW OF CRIMINAL EVIDENCE

(LAW727H1F)

H. L. Ho

BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY
SEP - 3 2008
FACULTY OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

COURSE MATERIALS FOR INTENSIVE COURSE

COMPARATIVE LAW OF CRIMINAL EVIDENCE

(LAW727H1F)

H. L. Ho

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/comparativelawof00holo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page numbers in bold and within square brackets

Session 1. Purpose of the criminal trial

- Antony Duff, Lindsay Farmer, Sandra Marshall and Victor Tadros, *The Trial on Trial*, vol 3, *Towards a Normative Theory of the Criminal Trial* (Oxford: Hart, 2007), pp 62-69, 94-97, 142-3, 146, 147-8 **[6]**
- H L Ho, *A Philosophy of Evidence Law – Justice in the Search for Truth* (OUP, 2008), ch 2 ('Truth, Justice and Justification') **[16]**

Session 2. Hearsay Evidence

i) Rationales of the common law hearsay rule

- H L Ho, *A Philosophy of Evidence Law – Justice in the Search for Truth* (OUP, 2008), pp 232-239 **[34]**

ii) Approaches to hearsay evidence adopted in some common law jurisdictions:

- Common law: *Subramaniam v PP* [1956] 1 WLR 965, extracts from H Stewart et al, *Evidence – A Canadian Casebook* (Toronto: Emond Montgomery, 2006, 2nd ed), pp 132-134. **[38]**
- US: Federal Rules of Evidence 807 **[40]**
- Canada: *R v Smith* [1992] 2 SCR 915, from H Stewart et al, *Evidence – A Canadian Casebook* (Toronto: Emond Montgomery, 2006, 2nd ed), pp 212-218. **[41]**
- UK: s 114 Criminal Justice Act, J R Spencer, *Hearsay Evidence in Criminal Proceedings* (Hart: Oxford, 2008), pp 81-89 **[45]**

iii) Fundamental rights and hearsay evidence:

- *Grant v R* [2006] UKPC 2, [2007] 1 AC 1 (PC on appeal from Jamaica) **[50]**
- *R v Cole* [2007] EWCA Crim 1924, [2007] 1 WLR 2716 **[65]**

Session 3. The right of confrontation

Law:

i) Right of confrontation in the United States

- *Crawford v Washington* (2004) 158 L Ed 2d 177 (only majority judgment reproduced) **[84]**
- Andrew Choo, '*Crawford v Washington*: A View from Across the Atlantic' (2004) 2 Int'l Commentary on Evidence, article 4 **[93]**

ii) Right of the accused to examine or have examined witnesses against him in the European Union

- Art 6(3)(d), European Convention of Human Rights
- *Kostovski v The Netherlands* (Application no. 11454/85), judgment of the European Court of Human Rights 20 Nov 1989 **[105]**

- *Windisch v Austria* (Application no. 12489/86), judgment of the European Court of Human Rights, 27 September 1990 **[120]**
- *CRR Scheper v the Netherlands* (Application no. 39209/02); decision on admissibility by the European Court of Human Rights, 5 April 2005 **[127]**

[Edited version of 3 cases above reproduced in this bundle. Full version available at: http://www.echr.coe.int/ECHR/EN/Header/Case-Law/HUDOC/HUDOC+database/]

- Andrew Choo, above

Theory:

- Antony Duff, Lindsay Farmer, Sandra Marshall and Victor Tadros, *The Trial on Trial*, vol 3, *Towards a Normative Theory of the Criminal Trial* (Oxford: Hart, 2007), pp 116-118 **[134]**
- Sherman J Clark, '"Who Do You Think You Are?" The Criminal Trial and Community Character' in *The Trial on Trial Volume 2: Judgment and Calling to Account*, edited by A Duff et al (Oxford: Hart, 2006) pp 83-87, 90-94. **[136]**

Session 4. Similar fact evidence

Law:

- England:
  - *Makin v A G for New South Wales* [1894] AC 57, taken from H Stewart et al, *Evidence – A Canadian Casebook* (Toronto: Emond Montgomery, 2006, 2nd ed), pp 466-7 **[142]**
  - *DPP v P* [1991] 2 AC 447 **[143]**
  - s 98; s 99; ss 101(1)(d), (3); s 103(1)(a), *Criminal Justice Act 2003* **[157]**
  - see also s 78 Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 **[157]**
- US: Fed R of Evid 404(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence; FRE 413, 414, 403 **[158]**
- Canada: *R v Handy* (2002) 213 DLR (4th) 385, extracts from H Stewart et al, *Evidence – A Canadian Casebook* (Toronto: Emond Montgomery, 2006, 2nd ed), pp 499-522 **[159]**
- Australia:
  - Common law: *Pfennig v R* (1995) 182 CLR 461 (extracts from Jill Hunter, Camille Cameron and Terese Henning, *Litigation II: Evidence and Criminal Process* (7th edn, LexisNexis Butterworths: Australia, 2005) pp 1318-1321). **[172]**
  - Statutory version: sections 97, 98 and 101 Uniform Evidence Acts (see also s 135, 137 thereof) **[176]**; *R v Ellis* (2003) 58 NSWLR 700, and judgment of McHugh J in *Pfennig v R* (1995) 182 CLR 461 (extracts from Hunter *et al*, *Litigation II* above, pp 1368-1371) **[177]**

Theory:

- Antony Duff, Lindsay Farmer, Sandra Marshall and Victor Tadros, *The Trial on Trial*, vol 3, *Towards a Normative Theory of the Criminal Trial* (Oxford: Hart, 2007), pp 110-116 [181]
- H L Ho, *A Philosophy of Evidence Law – Justice in the Search for Truth* (Oxford: OUP, 2008), pp 285-309 [185]

Session 5. Evidence of sexual history

(a) England

- s 41 Youth and Criminal Justice Act 1999, reproduced at pp 196-7, Murphy below
- *R v A (No. 2)* [2002] AC 45 (only Lord Steyn's judgment is reproduced) [198]
- Peter Murphy, *Murphy on Evidence* (OUP, 10th ed, 2007), pp 195-204 [207]

(b) US

- Federal Rules of Evidence 412, reproduced at p 201, fn 103, Murphy above
- George Fisher, *Evidence* (NY: Foundation, 2002), pp 288-298 [271]

(c) Canada

- s. 276 of the Canadian Criminal Code (appears at p. 551-2 in *Darrach* below)
- Paciocco and Stuesser, *The Law of Evidence* (Toronto: Irwin Law, 2005, 4th ed) pp 88-90 [226]
- *R v Darrach* (2000) 191 DLR (4th) 539 [228] (edited; on previous law, see *R v Seaboyer* [1991] 2 SCR 577, not reproduced in this bundle but relevant portions can be found in H Stewart et al, *Evidence – A Canadian Casebook* (Toronto: Emond Montgomery, 2006, 2nd ed), pp 94-126)

Session 6. Presumption of innocence

Dimensions and underpinning values

- Dale A Nance, 'Civility and the Burden of Proof' (1994) Harvard J of Law & Public Policy 647, at 647-658, 689-690 [238]
- R A Duff, *Answering for Crime – Responsibility and Liability in the Criminal Law* (Oxford: Hart Pub, 2007) at 195-197, 199-201 [252]
- *XP v PP* [2008] SGHC 107 at para 94 [256]; newspaper articles and letters:
    - The Straits Times, 12 May 2008, 'Statements on acquittal "cause grave concern"' [257]
    - The Straits Times, 14 May 2008, 'AG spokesman wasn't commenting on case' [259]
    - The Straits Times, 17 May 2008, 'There should be only one measure of guilt' [261]
    - The Straits Times, 12 July 2008, 'No question of guilt after acquittal' [262]

The legitimacy of reverse onus presumptions in criminal cases

- Singapore: *Ong Ah Chuan* [1980-81] SLR 48, 54-63 [265]
- Belize: *Vasquez* [1994] 1 WLR 1304 [278]

- UK: *Sheldrake v DPP; A G's Reference (No 4 of 2002)* [2004] UKHL 43; [2005] 1 AC 264 (only Lord Bingham's judgment is reproduced) [291]
- Canada: *R v Oakes* [1986] 1 SCR 103, extracts from H Stewart et al, *Evidence – A Canadian Casebook* (Toronto: Emond Montgomery, 2006, 2nd ed) 1008-1015 [320]

Session 7. Standard of proof beyond reasonable doubt

- H L Ho, *A Philosophy of Evidence Law*, (Oxford: OUP, 2008) at 213-228 [324]
- H L Ho, shortened version of seminar paper *Law of Evidence and the Ethics of Belief* [333]
- Larry Laudan, *Truth, Error, and Criminal Law* (CUP, 2006) pp 76-86 [343]
- *Took Leng How v PP* [2006] SGCA 3; [2006] 2 SLR 70, headnote and pp 80-81 [349]
- *Jagatheesan s/o Krishnasamy v PP* [2006] SGHC 129; [2006] 4 SLR 45, headnote and pp 58-63 [352]
- *PP v Chee Cheong Hin Constance* [2006] SGHC 9; [2006] 2 SLR 24, headnote and pp 44-47 [357]